



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,209	07/03/2001	Paul Henry Fuoss	1999-0591	2360
7590	01/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Samuel H. Dworetzky AT&T CORP. P.O. Box 4110 Middletown, NJ 07748-4110			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2645	
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004	

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/898,209	FUOSS ET AL.
	Examiner Md S Elahee	Art Unit 2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \*    c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>02</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 30 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 30 and 31 are belong to the same paragraph. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-15, 26-32, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,458).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Oh teaches detecting engagement of a mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) with an IWF device (i.e., docking station) (abstract; fig.2; col.4, lines 18-52).

Oh further teaches in response to the detecting, selecting at least one predetermined command from a plurality of predetermined commands, the predetermined command including an address of the server (i.e., network device) (abstract; fig.2; col.2, lines 13-25, col.5, lines 10-36).

Oh further teaches transmitting the predetermined command from the IWF device (i.e., docking station) to the server (i.e., network device) (abstract; fig.3; col.2, lines 13-25, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 2, Oh teaches transmitting the predetermined command to the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) (abstract; fig.2; col.2, lines 13-25, col.4, lines 18-52).

Oh further teaches transmitting the predetermined command from the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) to the server (i.e., network device) (abstract; fig.3; col.2, lines 13-25, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claims 3 and 31, Oh teaches transmitting the predetermined identifier from the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) to the server (i.e., network device), the predetermined identifier being associated with the predetermined command (abstract; fig.3; col.2, lines 13-25, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 4, Oh teaches transmitting the predetermined identifier from the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) to the IWF device (i.e., docking station) (abstract; fig.3; col.2, lines 13-25, col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 5, Oh teaches that the network device is an IWF device (i.e., docking station) (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 6, Oh teaches the network device is a network call controller (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 60-67, col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claims 7 and 29, Oh teaches that the predetermined command is configured to cause the network call controller to transfer an active phone call from the personal

communications device to an alternative communications device without an incoming ring signal (abstract; fig.3; col.3, lines 60-67, col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Oh teaches that the predetermined command further includes a phone number of the alternative communications device (col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claims 9 and 27, Oh teaches that the predetermined command further includes an address of the alternative communications device (abstract; fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 10, Oh teaches that the plurality of predetermined commands can be reconfigured (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 11, Oh teaches that personal communications device comprises a mobile terminal (i.e., cellular phone) (abstract; fig.2; col.4, lines 18-52).

Regarding claim 12, Oh teaches that the network call controller comprises inherently a digital switch (col.3, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 13, Oh teaches that the alternative communications device comprises a land-line phone (fig.4; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 14, Oh teaches that the alternative communications device comprises a cellular phone (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-20).

Regarding claim 15, Oh teaches that the alternative communications device comprises a computer adaptively configured to receive, process, and transmit IP voice data through the network (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 29, Oh teaches that the transfer command is received from the first communications device (abstract; fig.2; col.4, lines 18-52).

Regarding claim 30, Oh teaches that the transfer command is received from the IWF device (i.e., second communications device) (abstract; fig.2; col.4, lines 18-52).

Regarding claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Oh teaches retrieving inherently an IP address (i.e., network address) of the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) from the mobile terminal (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Oh teaches identifying the network address of the mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) and a network address of a second network terminal (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

Regarding claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 34. Furthermore, Oh teaches redirecting the communications request to the IWF device (i.e., second network terminal) (abstract; fig.2, fig.3; col.4, lines 18-52, col.5, lines 10-36).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16-20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,458) and in view of Faccin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,092).

Regarding claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Oh fails to teach “detecting disengagement of a personal communications device”. Faccin teaches detecting call dropping (i.e., disengagement) of a mobile terminal (i.e., personal communications device) (abstract; fig.1, fig.4; col.2, lines 34-39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oh to allow detecting disengagement of a personal communications device as taught by Faccin. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the status of the call set up.

Regarding claims 17-20 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 5-7 and 10.

Regarding claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 16.

6. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,458) and in view of Janninck et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0017810).

Regarding claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Oh teaches a port, inherently coupled to the processor, and adapted to be coupled to a network (abstract; fig.2; col.1, line 64-col.2, line 3).

Oh fails to teach “a housing adaptively configured to receive a personal communications device”. Janninck teaches a housing adaptively configured to receive a radiotelephone (i.e., personal communications device) (fig.5; page 4, paragraph 0033). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oh to allow a housing adaptively configured to receive a personal communications device as taught by

Janninck. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the support for the mobile device.

Oh further fails to teach “a processor coupled to the housing”. Janninck teaches a processor coupled to the housing (fig.5; page 4, paragraph 0033). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oh to allow a processor coupled to the housing as taught by Janninck. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide control signal to the transceiver.

Oh further fails to teach “a memory, coupled to the processor, to store instructions adapted to be executed by the processor”. Janninck teaches a memory, coupled to the processor, to store operational signal (i.e., instructions) adapted to be executed by the processor (fig.5; page 4, paragraph 0033). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oh to allow a memory, coupled to the processor, to store instructions adapted to be executed by the processor as taught by Janninck. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store and retrieve data as well as perform operation.

Regarding claims 22 and 24 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 2.

Regarding claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 3.

Regarding claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 10.

Art Unit: 2645

7. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,458) and in view of Mikkola et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,143).

Regarding claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 34 and 35. Furthermore, Oh fails to teach “retrieving a set of filter conditions associated with the second network terminal”. Mikkola teaches retrieving a set of screening (i.e., filter) conditions associated with the second network terminal (abstract; col.3, lines 56-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Oh to allow retrieving a set of filter conditions associated with the second network terminal as taught by Mikkola. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to retrieve relevant records of the destination being screened from the database.

#### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Art Unit: 2645

M. E.  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
January 11, 2004

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

